

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:  
John Hevesi et al.

Application No.: 10/822,159

Confirmation No.: 2644

Filed: April 14, 2004

Art Unit: 3617

For: PADDLE BLADE, SHAFT AND GRIP

Examiner: Edwin L. Swinehart

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Pre Appeal Brief Request for Review**

Dear Examiner:

This Request is responsive to the Office Action dated July 29, 2009 noting a defective Pre Appeal Brief Request for Review filed on July 17, 2009, which included a Notice of Appeal. The Pre Appeal Brief Request for Review filed on July 17, 2009 was responsive to the Office Action dated January 22, 2009, although it contained textual errors in its substantive arguments. This Pre Appeal Brief Request for Review is being filed to correct those errors contained in the brief filed on July 17, 2009.

**Status**

Claims 18 and 20 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; claims 18 and 20 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,796,862 (“Abbenhouse et al.”); claims 1, 3 – 6, 9, 10, 18, and 20 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abbenhouse et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 2,205,769 (“Sweetland”); and claims 7 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abbenhouse et al. in view of Sweetland as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. D320,375 (“Bruce”). Claims 1, 3 – 10, 18, and 20 – 22 are pending and are examined on the merits.

**I. Claims 18 and 20 – 22 DO NOT Fail to Comply with the Written Description Requirement**

In the Office Action dated January 22, 2009, the Examiner states that no basis exists for claiming “at least three ribs” in claim 18. In Applicants’ response dated December 16, 2008, this particular claim

language was deleted. Therefore, it is believed that Claim 18 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 20 – 22 depend from previously amended Claim 18 and include all its limitations, therefore they are also believed to be allowable because they are dependent upon previously amended claim 18.

## **II. Claims 18 and 20 – 22 are NOT Unpatentable over Abbenhouse et al.**

In the Office Action dated January 22, 2009, claims 18 and 20 – 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as discussed above. For a *prima facie* case of obviousness to be established, the following factual inquiries as enunciated in *Graham* must be determined: (A) determining the scope and contents of the prior art; (B) ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue; (C) determining the level of skill in the pertinent art; and (D) evaluating any evidence of secondary considerations. Further, in *KSR*, a number of rationales for supporting a conclusion of obviousness consistent with the “functional approach” in *Graham* were laid out. Additionally, it is key that the Examiners articulate their reasons why the claimed invention would have been obvious. (MPEP 2143)

### **A. Independent Claim 18**

Respectfully, the Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s rejection. The cited reference does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In light of the previously amended claim 18, Abbenhouse et al. does not teach three ribs that extend distally from the longitudinal centerline of the skeleton towards the outer periphery of the paddle blade. Further, Abbenhouse et al. does not teach a paddle blade that has a single-piece skeleton and an injection molded outer surface that encloses and directly contacts the single-piece skeleton. Additionally, Abbenhouse et al. discloses two branches 43 and 44 that “diverge out toward the blade tip 39, but terminate short of the blade tip 39.” (Col. 3, Lns. 18 – 20) As can be seen in Figures 1A and 1B of Abbenhouse et al., the branches do not extend distally from the longitudinal centerline of its body towards the outer periphery of the paddle blade where they end substantially at the outer periphery of the paddle blade. Thus, these branches do not provide the same magnitude of lateral and longitudinal support to the blade tip and outer tips of the blade as the skeleton and ribs of the present application.

Moreover, Abbenhouse et al. uses an internal foam section to create an outer surface shape during molding. This outer shape is what increases the strength of the final part. Additionally, the internal foam section of Abbenhouse et al. does not carry any load, but rather allows the forming of a cross sectional shape that once molded from composite carries the load placed on the blade during paddling more efficiently than a flatter profile. The central foam component in Abbenhouse et al. is

NOT load bearing and provides no increase in strength beyond that of allowing a unique shape to be molded in the outer skin.

Conversely, the present invention provides both the internal and external components that are load bearing. The internal structural skeletal ribs are designed to be a load bearing component that not only provides a unique cross-sectional profile, but also adds to the blade's ability to carry loads beyond those provided only by modifying the outer shape of the component. The present invention's internal ribs are also designed in a way that allows it to be "tuned" in a manner that transmits energy from the outer skin back into the paddle shaft, thus increasing the load bearing capability of both the outer and inner components.

Claim 18 has been previously amended to clarify that the blade has a skeleton that has three ribs that extend laterally from the longitudinal centerline of a single-piece skeleton and that the outer surface is injection molded enclosing the single-piece skeleton. Thus, Abbenhouse et al. does not teach these limitations as disclosed and claimed in the present application. Applicants respectfully submit that this reference does not teach each and every claim element of the Applicants' application as amended herein, and thus does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, it is believed that this rejection is overcome and previously amended claim 18 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 20 – 22 depend from and include all the limitations of previously amended claim 18, thus they are also believed to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**III. Claims 1, 3 – 6, 9, 10, 18, and 20 – 22 are NOT Unpatentable over Abbenhouse et al. in view of Sweetland**

In the Office action dated January 22, 2009, claims 1, 3 – 6, 9, 10, 18, and 20 – 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as discussed above.

**A. Independent Claims 1 and 18**

Respectfully, the Applicants disagree with the Examiner's rejection. The cited references do not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Regarding Abbenhouse et al., the above arguments continue to apply. Regarding Sweetland, it does not teach a blade with a single-piece skeleton that has three ribs that extend distally from the longitudinal centerline of the skeleton to the outer periphery of the blade to reinforce the blade both longitudinally and laterally nor the above amended limitations. Therefore, the combination of Abbenhouse et al. and Sweetland do not teach each and every claim element and limitation as found in the previously amended independent claims 1 and 18.

Moreover, Sweetland teaches various independent interlocks that are specifically designed to resist movement in one plane only. The pins used to hold the grips in place (Figs. 1 – 4) resist movement in a rotational plane around the center axis of the shaft that the grip is wrapped around. The ridge used to hold the grip in place (element 24 of Fig. 3 and element 67 of Fig. 7) resists movement in the long axis plane lengthwise along the shaft to which the grip is mated. This combination of elements only functions properly if both items are used in combination with one another. If the pins are removed, the grip is free to rotate in one direction while if the ridges are removed, the grip is free to rotate in another direction.

Conversely, as argued before, the present invention discloses and claims a unique method of grip interlock that utilizes a single mating surface that incorporates a lock for all axis of available movement. By using a single multi-faceted surface to interlock the gripping member, the present invention resists movement in all planes without the use of pins or ridges. By eliminating the use of pins and/or edges in the underlying structure, the present invention is able to produce a final component that is both stronger and lighter than the design taught in Sweetland. This increased strength comes from the ability to design a mating surface that is free of hard edges.

For the reasons stated above with respect to Abbenhouse et al. in view of Sweetland, and in light of previously amended independent claims 1 and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that these two references do not form the basis of a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent claims 1 and 18. Therefore, it is believed that claims 1 and 18 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 3 – 6, 9, 10, and 20 – 22 depend from and include all the limitations of previously amended claims 1 and 18, respectively, thus they are also believed to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**IV. Claims 7 – 8 are NOT Unpatentable over Abbenhouse et al. in view of Sweetland, and further in view of Bruce**

In the Office action dated January 22, 2009, claims 7 – 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as discussed above.

**A. Independent Claims 1**

Respectfully, the Applicants disagree with the Examiner's rejection. The cited references do not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In addition to the arguments presented herein regarding Abbenhouse et al. and Sweetland, Bruce is a design patent that teaches an ornamental design for a paddle that includes a bent shaft but little else. In addition, Bruce teaches that the offset portion of the shaft incorporates two bends to the shaft at positions internal and external of the gripping section. This places

the center axis of the blade behind the users hand during use. By this arrangement, an amount of torque induced twisting is created due to the fact that the axis of the blade does not meet the center line of the gripping section of the grip. Conversely, the present application discloses and claims in claim 7 an ergonomic shaft and grip design that aligns the center axis of the blade with the center section of the gripping section. This is accomplished in claim 7 by having a shaft that incorporates three bends to allow for the center line of the blade to line up directly with the center point of the gripping section. These three bends are disclosed and found in claim 7, particularly, "...wherein the shaft is bent such that (1) a centerline of a first portion of the shaft is offset from a centerline of a second portion of the shaft by at least one of (i) more than 10 degrees and (ii) less than 17 degrees, and (2) a centerline of a third portion of the shaft bisect the center portion of the first portion of the shaft." These three bends provide that the center line of the blade lines up directly with the center point of the grip, thus decreasing the amount of torque induced twisting common in the design taught by Bruce.

For the reasons stated above with respect to Abbenhouse et al. in view of Sweetland, and further in view of Bruce, and in light of previously amended independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that these references do not form the basis of a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent claim 1. Therefore, it is believed that claim 1 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 7-8 depend from and include all the limitations of previously amended claim 1, thus they are also believed to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

### **Conclusion**

In view of the forgoing, the Panel is respectfully requested to allow claims 1, 3 – 10, 18, and 20 – 22. Applicants also submit an extension of time for one month with this filing. If any additional fees are due or any overpayments have been made; however, please charge or credit Deposit Account No. 50-2816 of Patton Boggs LLP, under Order No. 022306.0101PTUS from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted:

Respectfully submitted,  
**PATTON BOGGS LLP**

Dated: 9/18/09

By: 

Joseph V. Colaiani

Registration No.: 20,019

(202) 457-6174 (202) 457-6315 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant

**Customer No. 41434**